

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of **December 15, 2004**. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-21** is respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. published application 2001/0031043).

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to be directed to a printing device. Claim 1 further recites that the printing device is configured to cause a message to be transmitted to a mobile device based on an error status. As will be described in greater detail in the following paragraphs, the references of record fail to teach or suggest a printing device having the claimed features.

Kim teaches using an internet phone 40 as a networking hub in a home office (paragraph [0002]). Kim mentions that a peripheral device 10 can be connected to the internet phone 40 through a function extending unit 20 (see Figures 1 and 2, parag. [0030]). Peripheral device 10 is only mentioned in paragraphs [0030] and [0079], and there is no discussion of any particular features that the peripheral device 10 can perform. The peripheral device 10 is only described as being a CD-ROM, a printer, or a hard disk.

Thus, Kim fails to teach or suggest a peripheral device that has any capabilities that are similar to those presently claimed. For example, the peripheral device 10 does not establish a communication channel to a mobile device as claimed. Rather, the internet phone 40 or network CPU unit 30 (Figure 6, 7) are capable of establishing communication with the internet. The peripheral device 10 only communicates with the internet phone 40 or network CPU unit 30 in a

normal fashion, and is not configured to transmit or even be aware of communications with mobile devices.

Thus, Kim fails to teach or suggest a printing device having a controller that is configured to cause a message to be transmitted to a mobile device based on an error status as recited in claim 1. Since claim 1 recites features not taught or suggested by the reference, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-10 also patentably distinguish over the reference and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 11

Claim 11 is directed to a computer program product. Claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the program product is operable within a peripheral device for causing a communication path to be established between the peripheral device and a mobile device. Claim 11 further recites that the communication path allows messages to be transmitted between the peripheral device and the mobile device.

As previously explained, Kim teaches an internet phone 40 and a function extending unit 20 that allow various devices in a home to be connected to various networks (e.g. cable, internet, phone) See Figure 1. Peripheral device 10 is only mentioned in paragraphs [0030] and [0079], and there is no discussion of any particular features that the peripheral device 10 can perform. Indeed, the invention of Kim has nothing to do with the peripheral device at all except that it can be connected to an internet phone 40.

Additionally, paragraph [0060] of Kim was cited by the Office Action to support a teaching of establishing a communication path between the peripheral device 10 and a mobile device. However, paragraph [0060] describes a method of receiving a telephone call (see [0059]). The peripheral device 10 is not involved in this process and in fact, paragraph [0060] does not even mention the peripheral device 10.

Since Kim fails to teach or suggest any features of the peripheral device 10, Kim fails to teach or suggest a computer program product operable within a peripheral device as recited in

claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Kim. Accordingly, dependent claims 12-15 also patentably distinguish over the reference and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16 has been amended to recite a method for establishing a communication path between a printing device and a mobile device. Additionally, claim 16 has been amended to clarify that the method comprises causing the printing device to perform the recited features.

Based on the teachings of Kim described above, Kim fails to teach or suggest a method where a printing device is caused to perform the recited features of claim 16. Therefore, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Kim. Accordingly, dependent claims 17-20 also patentably distinguish over the reference and are in condition for allowance.

The references of record that were cited but not applied to the claims have been considered. None of the references, individually or in combination with other references, teach or fairly suggest the present claims.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-21** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843

14-MAR-2005